

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

ANDREW PERRONG, individually and on  
behalf of a class of all persons and entities  
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NORDIC ENERGY SERVICES LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**Preliminary Statement**

1. Telemarketing calls are intrusive. A great many people object to these calls, which interfere with their lives, tie up their phone lines, and cause confusion and disruption on phone records. Faced with growing public criticism of abusive telephone marketing practices, Congress enacted the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991. Pub. L. No. 102-243, 105 Stat. 2394 (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227). As Congress explained, the law was a response to Americans ‘outraged over the proliferation of intrusive, nuisance calls to their homes from telemarketers’ *id.* § 2(6), and sought to strike a balance between ‘[i]ndividuals’ privacy rights, public safety interests, and commercial freedoms’ *id.* § 2(9).

2. “The law opted for a consumer-driven process that would allow objecting individuals to prevent unwanted calls to their homes. The result of the telemarketing regulations was the national Do-Not-Call registry. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2). Within the federal government’s web of indecipherable acronyms and byzantine programs, the Do-Not-Call registry stands out as a model of clarity. It means what it says. If a person wishes to no longer receive

telephone solicitations, he can add his number to the list. The TCPA then restricts the telephone solicitations that can be made to that number. *See id.*; 16 C.F.R. § 310.4(b)(iii)(B) ('It is an abusive telemarketing act or practice and a violation of this Rule for a telemarketer to . . . initiat[e] any outbound telephone call to a person when . . . [t]hat person's telephone number is on the "do-not-call" registry, maintained by the Commission.')...Private suits can seek either monetary or injunctive relief. *Id.*...This private cause of action is a straightforward provision designed to achieve a straightforward result. Congress enacted the law to protect against invasions of privacy that were harming people. The law empowers each person to protect his own personal rights. Violations of the law are clear, as is the remedy. Put simply, the TCPA affords relief to those persons who, despite efforts to avoid it, have suffered an intrusion upon their domestic peace." *Krakauer v. Dish Network, L.L.C.*, 925 F.3d 643, 649-50 (4th Cir. 2019).

3. The Plaintiff Andrew Perrong alleges that Nordic Energy Services LLC ("Nordic Energy") made unsolicited telemarketing calls to his residential telephone number that is listed on the National Do Not Call Registry.

4. Nordic did so despite Mr. Perrong indicating he did not wish to be contacted, and despite the fact that Mr. Perrong previously sued Nordic for identical conduct. *See Perrong v. Nordic Energy Serv's., LLC*, No. 1:19-cv-06745 (N.D. Ill. filed Oct. 11, 2019).

5. Because telemarketing calls typically use technology capable of generating thousands of similar calls per day, the Plaintiff sues on behalf of a proposed nationwide class of other persons who received similar calls.

6. A class action is the best means of obtaining redress for the Defendant's illegal telemarketing and is consistent both with the private right of action afforded by the TCPA and the fairness and efficiency goals of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

**Parties**

7. Plaintiff Andrew Perrong is a Pennsylvania resident.
8. Defendant Nordic Energy Services LLC is an Illinois limited liability company and a resident of this District with its principal place of business in Oakbrook Terrace, IL. The Defendant has a Registered Agent of Christopher D. Schuering, 506 Vermont St, Quincy, IL 62301.

**Jurisdiction & Venue**

9. The Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the Plaintiff's claims arise under federal law.
10. Nordic is a resident of this District.
11. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (2) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, as the telemarketing campaign that called the Plaintiff was organized from this District, and because the Defendant resides in this District.

**The Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

12. In 1991, Congress enacted the TCPA to regulate the explosive growth of the telemarketing industry. In so doing, Congress recognized that “[u]nrestricted telemarketing . . . can be an intrusive invasion of privacy[.]” Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-243, § 2(5) (1991) (codified at 47 U.S.C. § 227).

13. The National Do Not Call Registry (the “Registry”) allows consumers to register their telephone numbers and thereby indicate their desire not to receive telephone solicitations at those numbers. *See* 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).

14. A listing on the Registry “must be honored indefinitely, or until the registration is cancelled by the consumer or the telephone number is removed by the database administrator.”

*Id.*

15. The TCPA and implementing regulations prohibit the initiation of telephone solicitations to residential telephone subscribers to the Registry and provide a private right of action against any entity that makes those calls, or “on whose behalf” such calls are promoted. 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5); 47 C.F.R. § 64.1200(c)(2).

### **Factual Allegations**

16. Nordic is a competitive/alternative electric generation supplier that attempts to sell their deregulated services to residents of Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia.

17. To generate business of its electric services, Nordic relies on telemarketing.

18. In fact, Nordic previously settled a complaint for \$310,800 with the Illinois Commerce Commission related to their telemarketing tactics.

19. Plaintiff also accused Nordic of the same conduct previously. *See Perrong v. Nordic Energy Serv's., LLC*, No. 1:19-cv-06745 (N.D. Ill. filed Oct. 11, 2019).

### **The Calls to Mr. Perrong**

20. Plaintiff Perrong is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

21. Plaintiff’s telephone number is (215) 947-XXXX.

22. That phone number is used for residential purposes.

23. That phone number is not associated with a business.

24. Plaintiff registered his telephone number, 215-947-XXXX, on the National Do Not Call Registry on May 23, 2005, and the number has been on the Registry continuously since that time.

25. The Plaintiff received calls from the Defendant on July 8, 2022 and five calls on July 18, 2022.

26. The July 8 and first July 18 call used a similar script, where the Defendant claimed to be calling regarding discounts on electric service, indicated that the discounts had been approved or applied, and indicated that they had “called a few weeks ago”.

27. The calls advertised the availability of energy services for purchase.

28. The Plaintiff terminated the July 8 call.

29. The Plaintiff then engaged the telemarketer on the July 18 call.

30. The Plaintiff identified Nordic because he received a verification that it was Nordic calling from a third-party verification company as part of the telemarketing pitch for the call he received.

31. The Plaintiff was on the National Do Not Call Registry and so he did not complete the verification process.

32. Despite that, Nordic called him again four times on July 18 to attempt to get him to complete a verification to sign up for their services.

33. Plaintiff and the other call recipients were harmed by these calls. They were temporarily deprived of legitimate use of their phones because their phone lines were tied up during the telemarketing calls and their privacy was improperly invaded. Moreover, these calls injured Plaintiff and the other call recipients because they were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying,

were a nuisance and disturbed the solitude of plaintiff and the class. In some cases, other class members, including Plaintiff, were charged for the calls.

**Class Action Statement**

34. As authorized by Rule 23(b)(2) or (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of a class of all other persons or entities similarly situated throughout the United States.

35. The class of persons Plaintiff proposes to represent is tentatively defined as:

**National Do Not Call Registry Class:** All persons in the United States whose (1) telephone numbers were on the National Do Not Call Registry for at least 31 days, (2) but who received more than one telemarketing calls from or on behalf of Defendant (3) within a 12-month period, (4) from four years prior the filing of the Complaint.

This is referred to as the “Class”.

36. Excluded from the Class are counsel, the Defendant, and any entities in which the Defendant have a controlling interest, the Defendant’s agents and employees, any judge to whom this action is assigned, and any member of such judge’s staff and immediate family.

37. The Class as defined above are identifiable through phone records and phone number databases.

38. The potential members of the Class number at least in the thousands.

39. Individual joinder of these persons is impracticable.

40. The Plaintiff is a member of the Class.

41. There are questions of law and fact common to Plaintiff and to the proposed Class, including but not limited to the following:

(a) whether Defendant systematically made multiple telephone calls to members of the National Do Not Call Registry Class;

- (b) whether Defendant made calls to Plaintiff and members of the Classes without first obtaining prior express written consent to make the calls;
- (c) whether Defendant's conduct constitutes a violation of the TCPA;
- (d) whether members of the Class are entitled to treble damages based on the willfulness of Defendant's conduct.

42. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of members of the Class.

43. Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class, he will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class, and he is represented by counsel skilled and experienced in class actions, including TCPA class actions.

44. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting only individual class members, and a class action is the superior method for fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. The only individual question concerns identification of class members, which will be ascertainable from records maintained by Defendant and/or their agents.

45. The likelihood that individual members of the class will prosecute separate actions is remote due to the time and expense necessary to prosecute an individual case.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

**(Violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227)**

**(On Behalf of Plaintiff and the National Do Not Call Registry Class)**

46. Plaintiff repeats the prior allegations of this Complaint and incorporates them by reference herein.

47. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf constitute numerous and multiple violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, by making telemarketing calls, except for emergency

purposes, to the Plaintiff and the Class despite their numbers being on the National Do Not Call Registry.

48. The Defendant's violations were negligent, willful, or knowing.

49. As a result of Defendant's and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf violations of the TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227, Plaintiff and members of the Class presumptively are entitled to an award of between \$500 and \$1,500 in damages for each and every call made.

50. Plaintiff and members of the Class are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on Defendant's behalf from making telemarketing calls to numbers on the National Do Not Call Registry, except for emergency purposes, in the future.

#### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for the following relief:

- A. Certification of the proposed Class;
- B. Appointment of Plaintiff as a representative of the Class;
- C. Appointment of the undersigned counsel as counsel for the Class;
- D. A declaration that Defendant and/or their affiliates, agents, and/or other related entities' actions complained of herein violate the TCPA;
- E. Plaintiff and members of the Class are also entitled to and do seek injunctive relief prohibiting Defendant and/or its affiliates, agents, and/or other persons or entities acting on

Defendant's behalf from making calls, except for emergency purposes, to any residential number listed on the National Do Not Call Registry in the future.

- F. An award to Plaintiff and the Class of damages, as allowed by law; and
- G. Orders granting such other and further relief as the Court deems necessary, just, and proper.

**JURY DEMAND**

**Plaintiff requests a jury trial as to all claims of the complaint so triable.**

PLAINTIFF,  
By his attorneys

/s/ Anthony I. Paronich  
Anthony I. Paronich  
Paronich Law, P.C.  
350 Lincoln Street, Suite 2400  
Hingham, MA 02043  
(508) 221-1510  
[anthony@paronichlaw.com](mailto:anthony@paronichlaw.com)

Dated: July 19, 2022